

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1, 2, 6-11, 25-27, 31 and 48-65 are pending in the application; that claims 1, 2, 6-11, 25-27, 31, 48-53, and 55-60 are allowed; and that claims 54 and 61-65 are rejected. By this response, claims 25, 54, 61 and 63-64 have been amended, and new claims 66-71 have been added. Thus, claims 1-2, 6-11, 25-27, 31, and 48-71 are pending in the application.

Claim Objections

Claims 63 and 64 are objected to by the Examiner because of the following informalities: In claim 63, line 2, the term "porition" should be changed to "portion". Correction has been made to claim 63. Secondly, claim 64 has been amended to render the claim definite by re-reciting the manner in which the first rod portion and the second rod portion diverge apart. Accordingly, the objections to claims 63 and 64 are believed to be overcome, and withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

Allowed and Allowable Claims

Applicant respectfully thanks the Examiner for the allowance of claims 1, 2, 6-11, 25-27, 31, 48-53, and 55-60. Furthermore, the Examiner has stated that claim 54 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as stated in the instant Office Action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Examiner has also stated that claims 61-65

would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as stated in the instant Office Action.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claims 54 and 61-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 54 has been amended to render the claim definite by re-reciting how the first rod portion and the second rod portion converge nearer together.

Claim 61 has been amended to render the claim definite (along with dependent claims 62 and 65). The term "impart" has been changed to "provide". Claim 63 has been amended to correct a typographical error to now read "portion".

Claim 64 has been amended to clarify the manner in which the first rod portion and second rod portion diverge apart.

Hence, Applicant asserts that claims 54 and 61-65 are now believed to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

New Claims

New claims 66-71 are added herein. New claims 66-68 correspond with previously presented claims 3-5. Likewise, new claims 69-71 correspond with previously presented

claims 28-30. Previously presented claims 3-5 and 28-30 were previously withdrawn by the Examiner, and were subsequently cancelled by Applicant. In a telephone call with the Examiner, the Examiner indicated that he would allow dependent claims that had been previously withdrawn upon the allowance of a generic claim. It is believed that independent claim 1 is now allowable and is generic to claims 66-68. Likewise, it is believed that independent claim 25 is now allowable, and that claims 69-71 are allowable and dependent therefrom.

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claims 66-71 as such claims are believed to be encompassed by allowable generic claims.

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons advanced above, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance, and action to that end is respectfully requested. If the Examiner's next anticipated action is to be anything other than a Notice of Allowance, the undersigned respectfully requests a telephone interview before issuance of any such subsequent action.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 2/02/05

By: 

Keith D. Grzelak
Reg. No. 37,144